



DRAFT Meeting Minutes

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD (HAB, Board)

Full Board Meeting

January 25 and 26, 2023

Hybrid Meeting – In-person and via Microsoft Teams

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening.....	2
Selection of Board Chair, Vice Chair, and National Liaison.....	2
Introduction of the New EPA Regional Administrator	5
Operations Workgroup Update and Recommendations	9
Tri-Party Agreement Agency Updates	12
Draft Advice on Fiscal Year 2025 Cleanup Priorities	17
Connecting with Constituencies	18
Public Comment	21
Tri-Party Agreement Agency Update on 2023 HAB Membership Package	22
Board Business	24
Closing	25
Meeting Recording	25
Attachments	25
Meeting Attendees	26

This is only a summary of issues and actions discussed at this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of represented ideas or opinions, and it should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Opening

Mike Berkenbile, US Department of Energy (DOE), announced that this meeting was being held in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). He stated that the HAB's role was to provide policy-level advice and recommendations regarding DOE Environmental Management (DOE-EM) site-specific issues.

Mike provided a review of the meeting ground rules, which included:

- Listen carefully
- Honor the guidance of the chair and facilitator
- Be respectful and assume all participants have good intentions
- Minimize sidebar conversations in the room and in chat
- Mute yourself online or leave the room if you must answer a phone call

Ruth Nicholson, HAB Facilitator, reviewed the meeting agenda.

Draft Meeting Minutes

Board members were invited to submit comments on the draft meeting minutes for the:

- May 2022 Committee of the Whole (COTW)
- September 2022 COTW
- November 2022 COTW
- June 2022 HAB Meeting
- October 2022 HAB Meeting

Following incorporation of any comments submitted, the HAB chair would certify those minutes in accordance with the HAB's Operating Ground Rules.

Announcements

Ruth announced that 29 years ago on that day, the HAB held its first meeting in this same meeting room. That was part of the HAB first meeting, a three-day meeting that ran from January 24 to 26, 1994.

Selection of Board Chair, Vice Chair, and National Liaison

Lacey Mansius, HAB Facilitation Team, provided a review of the elections process. She stated that the current nominations would be reviewed first, then additional nominations would be welcomed. Willingness to serve would be confirmed for any individual nominated. Following nominations, each of the nominees would be offered the opportunity to provide statements and answer questions from the Board. When voting stated, Lacey would collect all votes, both in person and online.

The individuals nominated prior to the meeting included:

- Susan Coleman, Public at Large, Board chair.
- Miya Burke, Hanford Challenge, for Board vice chair.
- Jan Catrell, Washington League of Women Voters, for Board vice chair.
- Pam Larsen, Benton County, for national liaison.

Ruth clarified that the Board's vice chair and national liaison were elected autonomously. However, she explained, the Board's selection for chair was submitted to the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies and appointed by DOE. She noted that the term of service for each of those Board leadership positions was two years, from February 1, 2023 to January 31, 2025. She invited questions from the Board.

Rob Davis, City of Pasco, asked for a description of the duties and responsibilities for each of the positions. Mike Berkenbile suggested that, in the interest of time, that those interested should review the HAB's operating documents for that information.

Ruth invited additional nominations. None were offered. Starting with the nominee for chair, Ruth invited comments from the nominees.

Susan stated that she had no comment prepared and was willing to answer any questions from the Board. She stated that she was willing to serve and that she had just been renewed for a two-year term, so she would be available for that tenure. She was looking forward to continuing to work with the HAB.

Miya stated that, though she was a newly appointed Board member, she had been observing HAB meetings since October of 2021. She noted that she shared her background in the previous meeting, so would forego that this time. She hoped to bring a fresh perspective and energy. She valued the space the HAB created for groups to come together to reach consensus and build relationships of openness and trust. She looked forward to collaborating with the groups on the Board to address the challenges posed by Hanford cleanup. She thanked the Board for considering her as a candidate.

Jan explained that she had been serving as the interim HAB chair since that summer and considered that to be a privilege. She felt that Susan would make an excellent chair, as Susan had been known to work hard on behalf of the Board. Jan stated she had seen it during their time working together as part of the HAB operations workgroup, where they had both been actively involved in developing documents that would need to go the TPA agencies and DOE Headquarters. She noted that it was important for that group to put together a document that was valid, up to date, and reflected the way the Board operated. She stated that she looked forward to continuing to serve the Board and asked for the Board's vote.

Pam explained that the national liaison position was relatively new to the HAB, created based on a previous member's interest in being engaged in national-level issues. Additionally, she represented the City of Richland on the board of directors for the Energy Communities Alliance. In those roles, she worked with the elected officials of the four cities and two counties that comprised the Tri-Cities area to keep them apprised on what was going on at Hanford and help them engage with DOE and the regulators to share their views on the cleanup. She had the opportunity to tour various cleanup sites across the country, meet the local community leaders and regulators, and keep track of issues that were common to each of the cleanup sites, particularly sites to which Hanford was likely to send its waste.

Pam stated that, in her role as liaison, she kept the HAB informed about what was going on around the Environmental Management (EM) complex. She noted that Hanford competed with those sites for funding, so it was important to understand and respect such issues.

Ruth invited questions for the candidates from the Board.

Pam asked Jan to share her experience in Board leadership. Jan stated that she had served on the Board since 2014, and during that time, she served three terms in committee leadership as both chair and vice chair of the River and Plateau Committee (RAP), in addition to her present role as interim chair of the Board. She noted committee leadership allows one to be part of an annual leadership workshop during which the Board's work for the year is planned.

Jeff Wyatt, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board (OHCBC), noted that it was his understanding that Jan's membership term would be end at the end of the fiscal year (FY). Jan confirmed that she was term limited and discussed her history with the Board, from initial service as in Public at Large seat to her present role as primary for the Washington League of Women Voters. She stated that, as term limits were being

imposed on the Board more consistently, one could not expect to be reappointed. She noted that the end of her current term was at the end of September, which aligned a deadline for the HAB documents work she was contributing to as part of the operations workgroup.

Jeff made a follow-up comment, stating that succession planning is important for every organization. He felt that the Board had a choice of selecting a new leader to bring up to speed as one option, versus another option where Jan would be succeeded as chair and support that new chair from the vice chair position. He asked that Jan provide her perspective on that choice. Jan felt that was a good question and stated that, ideally, membership terms and leadership terms would align more closely. She noted that Miya had involved herself in all the HAB's committees and Issue Manager (IM) teams and done well in getting up to speed on HAB work. Jan stated that she was willing to mentor Miya in whatever manner was appropriate, but felt it was difficult to be certain of what a transition would consist of at the end of her term or if another election would be needed. She stated that she could not answer fully due to that uncertainty.

Laurene Contreras, Yakama Nation, stated that it seemed the Board should elect someone that could serve their full term, rather than deal with a cutoff date. She wondered if it would be better for Jan to serve in a volunteer capacity where the Board could benefit from the longevity of her service.

Michelle Holt, Benton-Franklin Council of Governments, asked for clarification on the rules and terms, as it seemed from the discussion that they were not defined at that point. Ruth explained that all three of the positions being considered were defined within the documents that the HAB worked to, and each were on the same schedule. Since term limits were being enforced more consistently, she explained, the Board lost both its chair and vice chair at the same time in a series of events that the Board did not plan on. She noted that, when the seats elected in that meeting were seated on February 1, the Board would be back on the schedule outlined in its operating documents. She stated that HAB appointment terms and the terms of leadership were two years each. When those start and end dates did not line up exactly, the membership appointment term would take precedence. Committee chairs served for one-year terms.

Todd Meyers, Washington Policy Center, noted that he was invited to consider running for one of the positions being considered, though it was his first official meeting as a member of the HAB. He decided not to run for that position because he felt that institutional memory was important. From his view as a new member, he hoped to have an experienced team guiding members through the transition. He stated that when one loses institutional memory, a lot was lost.

Tom Galioto, Tri-City Development Council (TRIDEC), asked about the applicability to Pam's seat. Pam stated that of the seats specified in the HAB's Memorandum of Understanding, local government seats were not subject to term limits under certain conditions. She stated that Benton County had indicated that they want her to continue to represent them for the following term.

Alfonso Contreras, Heart of America Northwest, wondered why rules for government seats would differ. Additionally, he felt that the Board's influence and capacity would be weakened when membership and leadership terms did not coincide. He agreed with Todd's sentiment that new members would benefit from having experienced leadership. He stated that he would prefer to follow a leader with history on the Board.

Gary Younger, DOE, clarified that leadership positions were meant for people to be shepherds of the Board processes and did not require subject matter expertise. Additionally, he clarified that term limit exceptions were not guaranteed for any seat, though he could make that request. He stated that the intent for term limits was to hear new voices and reach out to underserved communities.

The Board proceeded with voting.

Election Results

Susan Coleman would be recommended to the TPA agencies to serve as chair.

Miya Burke was selected as vice chair.

Pam Larsen was selected as national Liaison.

Introduction of the New EPA Regional Administrator

Casey Sixkiller, Regional Administrator for the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 10, introduced himself and the other EPA staff that were present. He explained that he joined the EPA in May of 2022. His grandfather was a chemist at Hanford and his mother and siblings grew up in the area, so he spent a lot of time in the Tri-Cities throughout the years.

He had the opportunity to go see the Hanford Site with DOE that day. He congratulated the HAB on its 29th anniversary, stating that it was a great accomplishment to continue sharing the public's perspectives on cleanup and continue the work the members did in the community. He appreciated the HAB's work and looked to advisory boards for those kinds of perspectives.

He noted that he joined EPA at a historic time for the agency. At the time he joined, the EPA's budget had just tripled as a result of the passage of a bipartisan infrastructure bill and the Inflation Reduction Act the prior year, enabling the agency to make historic investments. Potentially most importantly for the Hanford region, he stated that infrastructure bill that provided \$3.5 billion toward environmental remediation under the Superfund program and reinstated the Superfund tax.

He stated that environmental justice was a significant priority for President Biden and for EPA Administrator Regan, which was changing the way EPA did its work as an agency, including how it invested the resources it had access to. The EPA created a new national program office in November of 2022 and established an office of environmental justice and external civil rights, which would have a presidentially appointed and Senate-confirmed leader that would lead those roles at EPA. Environmental justice program investments at EPA rose from \$30 million to \$3 billion, so accountability, transparency, and a holistic approach across the agency would be increasingly important. The agency had just announced \$100 million in grants and programs and was helping people learn how to access resources from the federal government and understand what was coming up, including environmental justice opportunities.

In regard to Hanford, he stated that the cleanup would take longer and be more expensive than anyone anticipated in the beginning. Though EPA granted extensions to the project along the way, it never compromised on the quality of cleanup. He was proud that the River Corridor was being cleaned up safely for all future uses. He was glad to see the progress being made during his earlier tour, such as the reactor cocooning.

EPA was working with the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) in the effort to renew the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) permit, which was particularly complex, though very clear and with enforceable requirements site wide. EPA also continued to support Ecology and DOE to find a path forward for the Test Bed Initiative (TBI), an effort aimed at testing whether certain low activity mixed tank can be treated and disposed of in a safe way other than through vitrification.

He stated that, as far as he was aware, he was the first native person to sit in that position for EPA Region 10. With half of the tribes in the US being in Region 10, he hoped to bring a different lived experience to

the position. He was glad to see the tribal members in attendance for the meeting. He provided examples of the work EPA had done with the Yakama Nation in the region and other tribes throughout the nation, including work to establish the Record of Decision (ROD) for the 100-BC Operating Unit (OU). Concluding his statements, he thanked the Yakama Nation and others that contributed to those efforts.

Ruth Nicholson explained that the HAB was a board of interests, with each seat being established on the perspectives that they could bring. She invited the HAB members in the room to introduce themselves and the seats they represented.

Board Member Introductions

Susan Coleman stated that, as a Public at Large representative, she tried to reflect what she saw and heard from around the region.

Chris Sutton, Public at Large, explained that he was part of the team that closed the DOE site at Fernald and brought additional related experience internationally. As a member of the HAB, he focused on funding and budgets.

Esteban Ortiz, Public at Large, explained that he used to work with Washington Conservation Voters and had been involved with the HAB for over a year. He was glad to hear about the environmental justice priorities and noted that much of the Spanish-speaking community in the region was interested in Hanford Site concerns and needed more accessible information on such matters.

Tim Kovis, Public at Large, explained that we worked for the Washington Tree Fruit Association, which had a vested interest in the health of the Columbia River. He discussed his previously experience working with elected officials.

Jeff Wyatt discussed his background in project engineering, which included management of Superfund sites in Region 4. He brought that remediation experience as well as industrial work experience to the Board.

Max Woods, Oregon Department of Energy, explained his role as assistant director for the Oregon Department of Energy. He stated that his organization's focus on the HAB was protection of the Columbia River, which bordered Oregon communities.

Mason Murphy, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR), introduced himself as CTUIR's environmental sciences program manager.

Laurene Contreras worked with Yakama Nation's Environmental Restoration Waste Management (ERWM) program. As Yakama Nation's primary representative for the HAB, she communicated the concerns of the HAB to Yakama Nation's leaders and communicated Yakama Nation's concerns to the technical representatives at the Hanford Site.

Rose Ferri, Yakama Nation, provided additional details on the work done on the 100-BC ROD. She commended EPA on its support for the Yakama Nation in that effort.

McClure Tosch, Yakama Nation, had also worked with EPA for years on various Superfund sites, in addition to serving as the natural resource injury assessment lead.

Dan Strom, Benton-Franklin Health District, provided detail on his background in radiation protection and radiation risk assessment.

Todd Meyers explained that he served as the environmental director for Washington Policy Center and worked in the environmental field for about 20 years on issues such as old growth, the spotted owl, and salmon recovery.

Jan Catrell stated that she supported the Washington League of Women voters that supported “small-D” democratic processes in a non-partisan manner. She noted that she supported development of 100-BC advice the HAB issued several years prior, in cooperation with EPA, and noted that she has previous experience working with EPA through her work for US Customs and Border Protection.

Alfonso Contreras noted that he represented Heart of America Northwest as a concerned citizen regarding the Hanford Site.

Jessica Black, Columbia Riverkeeper, was an environmental sciences professor with Heritage University and the director of the Center for Indigenous Health, Culture & the Environment.

Simone Anter, Columbia Riverkeeper, explained that Columbia Riverkeeper was a non-profit with the goal of protecting and restoring the Columbia River and all life connected to it from its headwaters on downward.

Rob Parmelee, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees, stated that he worked for Bechtel as the Waste Treatment Plan (WTP) enforcement coordinator, among other roles. He had a background in nuclear power plant operations and engineering.

Miya Burke introduced herself as the program manager for Hanford Challenge, a non-profit in Seattle that worked closely with Hanford Site workers, insiders, and whistleblowers on-site, in addition to providing education and outreach through schools, universities, and to the general public, to assist citizens in understanding what was being done on the Hanford Site.

Tom Galioto explained that TRIDEC worked with the local community, businesses, and governments to support growth of the community. He stated that it was his eighth and final year with the Board and he had a decade of experience working directly for the Hanford site at reactors and in fuel fabrication, in addition to a couple decades of commercial nuclear experience. He had a vested interest in seeing the Hanford Site cleaned up.

Steve Anderson, Grant and Franklin Counties, stated that he was a 40-year resident that was interested in seeing cleanup done. He noted that he had supported the Hanford Site at a subcontractor level.

John Smart, West Richland, represented the citizens of West Richland. He explained that he served on the city council and had a background in sampling and radiation protection.

Bob Thompson, City of Richland, represented the City of Richland and was a citizen of the area for about 70 years. He had a “vibrant” interest in advising DOE on its cleanup mission.

Rob Davis represented the City of Pasco, reporting back to the city council and city manager. He had a background nuclear industry, ranging from fuels research to construction of the WTP. He hoped to bring a technical perspective to the Board to see what could be done to clean up the Hanford Site.

Michelle Holt was the executive director for the Benton-Franklin Council of Governments, a metropolitan planning organization. She noted that she worked with EPA on a brownfields assessment grant. She had a personal interest in serving on the HAB as she came from a family of nuclear reservation employees.

Pam Larsen explained that she was recently retired, having previously served as the executive director for Hanford Communities. Her task in that role was to keep the elected officials of the four cities and

informed about Hanford issues and assist them in engaging with DOE and regulatory agencies. Additionally, she has served on the Board of the National Energy Communities Alliance.

With introductions concluded, Ruth provided additional details about the Board, explaining that it operated by consensus when developing advice. She invited questions for Casey from the Board.

Laurene explained that, as program administrator for Yakama Nation's ERWM, she was there to protect the natural resources and cultural and sacred sites on the Hanford Site that were ceded to the government by the treaty of 1855. She hoped that the treaty rights would be upheld and acknowledged. She explained that it had been over 70 years since the tribal members had been able to go to those sites to engage in their traditional practices. She worried that it would not be cleaned up to the standards that Yakama Nation would expect or would be safe for those members to go to that site to engage in such practices.

As a Yakama Nation representative, Laurene was representing the Yakama Nation's elected officials and 13,000 tribal members that hoped to again be able to practice their treaty rights. She asked if EPA would be willing to write a letter that supported that. Additionally, she extended an invitation for Casey to meet with the Yakama Nation's elected officials and go on the tours the Yakama Nation conducted. She felt it was important for him to understand the roles that Yakama Nation had in protecting the continued involvement and practices of the tribal members. She hoped to expect the best from each agency and each group participating within the HAB to see those wishes of cleanup fulfilled, knowing that it would be a multigenerational effort.

Casey responded, stating that he would be happy to visit the Yakama Nation and meet with tribal leaders. He noted that EPA worked with the Yakama Nation on a number of issues beyond Hanford and that he valued that partnership. He noted that the Biden Administration was challenging federal agencies to meet and exceed their commitments in government-to-government relationships and upholding treaty rights, and he felt that EPA was leading the way in that regard through the years. He expected that there could be improvement still but believed that the direction from the President was meaningful. Traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) was another priority for the administration and an area where EPA was engaged. He hoped to continue building a relationship and partnership with tribal representatives and appreciated those that were there participating in the HAB.

Tom Galioto was interested in how Casey viewed the relationship between the TPA agencies and if he had any priority interests as he took on his new role. Casey viewed the relationships as being good. He noted that there was not always agreement, but the leaders of each agency were able to have direct conversations while their teams were working in concert with one another. He noted that there were big milestones coming up and he felt it would be worth taking the time to celebrate those milestones and ensuring the community was aware of the progress being made.

Rob Davis was interested in the TBI, stating that, per the *Weapons Complex Monitor*, it was not funded for the following year meaning that there would be no activity on the effort. He felt that TBI needed to move forward in the interest of cleanup progress, as the results of the initiative were needed in order to make decisions. Casey agreed to follow up on that concern.

Following up, Pam stated that getting tank waste treated was a priority for the people of the region. She felt that EPA's encouragement would be beneficial.

Dan Solitz, OHCB, noted that he did not expect that there was enough time in the Board meeting to discuss it, but was interested in what environmental justice opportunities might be available through EPA. Casey agreed to follow up with a summary of those opportunities. Esteban also noted his interest, stating that such opportunities could benefit the communities that speak other languages.

Simone noted that Columbia Riverkeeper was concerned about DOE's language that suggested the River Corridor would be cleaned in the next five years, however, it did not address the characterization of contamination along the river. She stated that it was EPA's responsibility to protect the area and asked what EPA could be doing to ensure that River Corridor decisions protected all future uses of the site. Casey stated that EPA continued to work with DOE and others to ensure that controls and permitting were aligned with EPA's standards, while being mindful of the concerns of tribal members. He was willing to hold a longer conversation on that matter in the future.

In closing, Casey thanked the Board for its time as volunteers and the members' willingness to be part of the process and ask questions. He stated that the Board was an important part of that process and EPA was trying to be as responsive as it could with the feedback received. He expected to meet with the Board again in the future.

Operations Workgroup Update and Recommendations

Chris Sutton provided an overview of the HAB's operations workgroup, including what it was currently working on and its plans going forward.

Chris started with an overview of who the group consisted of, noting that it was a diverse group consisting of HAB members, TPA agency representatives, and facilitation support. He stated that the group met on an almost monthly basis to try and accomplish its work, which included getting the HAB's operational and guidance documents in better alignment with the Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board (EMSSAB) charter and operating procedures, as well as ensuring the HAB's operations were in alignment with its scope and the Hanford Site's anticipated needs. He noted the group had been involved in other activities, such as planning for HAB member orientation, that the presentation would not be covering.

The group hoped to revise the HAB's documents not only for compliance, but for clarity and efficiency as well. He stated that there were a number of documents that stated the same information in different ways, leading to ambiguity and confusion.

The group also examined the HAB's charter and Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to compare the scope of the HAB as defined within those documents and what the HAB was or was not doing in comparison. The group found that the scope between the two documents was largely the same.

Tom Sicilia, Oregon Department of Energy, contributed stating that the workgroup was chartered by the Executive Issued Committee (EIC) and the work was done within the HAB's process. He noted that there was an overarching question of if the HAB's scope was appropriate and sufficient. The group examined gaps where the scope was not covered by committees and if the committees as they currently exist would suffice as the Hanford Site shifted toward operations.

He explained that the group agreed that the scope as defined was appropriate for the HAB, and in some cases suggested additional scope items for future inclusion. As a result of that examination, the group found that there was likely room for improvement in how the committees were organized in relation to the HAB's scope. He noted that the group identified several cross-cutting topics, as well as some that were not covered by the committees.

Tom Sicilia described an exercise in which the group examined that scope and looked for logical groupings of individual parts of the scope. Some items were found to cross each grouping, which resulted in the group's idea of "resource teams." The group believed that a significant strength of the HAB was its members' willingness to step up, learn, and share knowledge with the Board. Tom Sicilia suggested that

the teams could have something like a book club. Space would be reserved for these teams on all committee agendas.

He reviewed a chart in the presentation slides that showed cross cutting scope items that could be covered by resource teams and the themes of scope items that were grouped to be covered by committees. He noted that group names were only placeholders, rather than proposed committee names.

Tom Sicilia explained that the next step was a discussion of the concept with each of the HAB's committees, followed by a Committee of the Whole (COTW) dedicated to the subject in March. He encouraged all members to participate as details of potential recommendations were being sorted. The goal by the end of March was to have a recommendation for a new committee structure formed that could be implemented by the start of the next fiscal year. It was noted that the limit of membership for two committees may no longer apply. Additionally, DOE-EM had a deadline for completion of the HAB's operating documents in that same time frame.

Questions were invited from the Board.

Rose Ferri asked for clarification on committee membership limitations. Ruth Nicholson explained that, under the present practice, each HAB member was permitted to join up to two committees as a result of travel budget limitations. She stated that the workgroup was looking to see if that was still a logical practice, given the option for remote participation.

Esteban Ortiz remarked on the HAB membership's willingness to learn, noting that he felt that institutional knowledge was particularly important. He hoped that such knowledge would not be lost through changes to the Board.

Jeff Wyatt was curious about the present level of participation on the Board and its committees. Gary Younger did not have the data immediately available but suggested that it followed along with the "80/20 rule" where 20% of the participants did 80% of the work. Upon hearing that answer, Jeff wondered if there would be enough HAB members to staff the resource teams effectively. Tom Sicilia clarified that a resource team could consist of only one person, providing an example where Chris became an expert of the Hanford Lifecycle Scope, Schedule and Cost Report (LSSCR) to present on the subject to the Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC). It was expected that additional input during the following committee meetings and the COTW would shape the form such a recommendation would take.

Rob Davis felt that the setup was complex and could be difficult to manage. He felt that the Board's advice was produced effectively from the existing committee structure and IM team process. He stated that, as advice was formed through IM teams and committees, members became subject matter experts (SMEs). He did not understand the need for a group of SMEs on the scope items applied to resource teams, stating that it seemed duplicative. He suggested that the proposal could be refined further.

Jan Catrell wondered what the implementation of a new committee structure might look like. In relation to the discussion of travel, she suggested that there might need to be additional travel allocation for the Board while the Board members adjusted to or found their places in the new proposed committee structure.

Chris provided another example where the HAB has done something similar to the resource team proposal. When the Board learned of the B-109 tank leak, the Tank Waste Committee (TWC) established an IM team. Around that same time, the BCC established an IM team to develop advice on cleanup priorities. He envisioned that there may be several instances where multiple committees contributed to a single piece of advice. He thought the concept could open up the "blindness" for each committee.

When discussion resumed on the second day, questions and discussion resumed.

Rose wondered about the option of having her organization's SMEs attend committee meetings and having them speak. Ruth explained that, since COVID-19 impacted Board operations, the workgroup was looking at what practices worked best for the HAB and how it wanted those meetings to run, while better aligning those operations with FACA. Tom Sicilia clarified that there was a general agreement in the workgroup that committee meetings were open to the public, only members of a committee would be able to vote or take HAB actions. Susan Coleman contributed, stated that her understanding of the HAB's operating ground rules and the EMSSAB charter aligned with that stance. She noted that in a recent IM team meeting there were several non-members that contributed to the discussions.

Michelle Holt asked about the difference between quarterly HAB meetings and the COTW. Ruth explained that COTW meetings were initially conceived as a means of adapting to Federal Register requirements and intended to be nimbler. They were designed to be like a Board meeting in structure, but typically featuring informational or discussion topics, rather than involving decision-making. Michelle wondered if the topics applied to the resource team concept might be better suited for the COTW.

Tom Sicilia explained that IM teams were traditionally a means to provide advice through a formal process, while COTW meetings were required more planning and were more cumbersome for that function. He stated that the resource team idea was new and open for discussion and development. He expanded on the comparison to book clubs, stating that would allow a couple individuals to get on a call to discuss a topic and get up to speed on it. They could be used to call attention to items that might impact committees, without being overly formal in structure. Chris noted that not all of those topics would be of interest to all members either.

Dan Solitz wondered if public and interested parties were welcomed to speak at COTW meetings in the same manner of other committees. It was confirmed that was the practice in place.

Pam Larsen stated that she understood the breakout of potential committees but felt that the expectation for engagement in the resource team concept was overly optimistic. She was unclear as to the reasoning for selection of subjects applied to the resource teams, stating that they were not policy issues, but definitive matters. Tom Sicilia clarified that the intention was to have members effectively be or become SMEs on the cross-cutting subjects and disseminate related information, rather than having presentations provided to each committee on those subjects. He stated that there was not necessarily a need for there to be always active resource teams on the listed subjects. They could be engaged as those subjects became relevant, such as Chris's efforts in presenting on the LSSCR.

Tom Galioto noted that there were a number of questions on the resource teams. He felt it would be helpful to have a complete description of how those teams would function, how they were initiated, and how they would interact with committees. Tom Sicilia stated that it was an initial concept and ideas were still forming. It was conceptualized that the cross-cutting topics of relevance for a given year would be identified during the Leadership Workshop during work planning. Ruth clarified that the Leadership Workshop was an annual meeting of the EIC and TPA agencies during which HAB work was planned for the upcoming fiscal year. Additionally, it served as a place for addressing operations and other issues.

In conclusion, Ruth discussed the next steps for the operations workgroup. The operations workgroups had an upcoming session to work on HAB operational documents, representatives of the workgroup would be conversing with individual committees, and a COTW meeting on the committee concept would be held on March 7. A more refined committee proposal to was to be developed at the COTW, which would be sent to the EIC and, subsequently, the Board for approval.

Tri-Party Agreement Agency Updates

US Department of Energy

Brian Vance, DOE, introduced himself. He was glad to be there to see the Board members in-person and appreciated the continuing dialogue those sessions allowed them to have. He asked that the members provide feedback to their constituencies, feeling that such dialogue was critical to success.

Brian introduced DOE's assistant managers, which included Delmar Noyes for the tank farms; Bill Hamel for the river and plateau; Brian Harkens for mission support; Tom Fletcher for the WTP; Greg Jones for business operations; Glen Trenchard for safety, quality, and the environment; as well as Brian Stickney, the deputy site manager. He hoped their presence would help provide a visual of the Hanford Site's quality of leadership and experience.

He provided an overview of DOE's Hanford Site mission: a safe, efficient, and effective cleanup, that is protective of the workforce, public, and environment. He noted that there were a number of tenants on the site, such as the Energy Northwest and the Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatory (LIGO). Health and safety of the workforce remained a top priority. He noted that the key activities listed in the presentation slide demonstrated the breadth of activities that DOE was engaged in onsite. DOE prioritized creating an environment for its contractors to deliver world-class safety and performance and, as the site worked toward a 24/7/365 operations culture, to achieve seamless performance between DOE and its contractors.

Brian discussed a slide showing budget highlights, noting that there had been an increase in budget over the last four fiscal years (FY). He stated that reflected the confidence Congress had in DOE's performance. He explained that much of the money spent on subcontracting, both by DOE and its prime contractors, was offered to small businesses. That effort was intended to strengthen the industrial base and local economy, as many of the small businesses engaged in Hanford were local. That represented some of the impact that Hanford operations had beyond the borders of the site. He noted that the cesium and strontium capsule transfer equipment shown on the slide was fabricated by Hi-Line, a local business.

Brian provided an overview of its contractor partners, discussing who they were and what they did. DOE's goal was to achieve an enterprise team with no "borders" between contractors and the Department. This effort was seen as vital as the site moved toward 24/7 operations, along with the consistently enforced safety and ethics culture.

He stated that there was a talented group of dedicated professionals that supported the Hanford Site across all functional areas. Over 12,300 people were badged to work on the Hanford Site, representing the largest source of employment for the Tri-Cities. He stated that DOE took that responsibility seriously and felt that there was a nobility to the work, helping to create a positive work culture. He hoped that positivity could continue to be taken from the job and into the community. He hoped to continue to celebrate the Hanford Site's successes. He stated that was pivotal to recruiting and retention. There were two job fairs held for the Hanford Site in 2022, featuring opportunities both for DOE and its contractors.

He discussed the "Our Commitment to Community" slide, which featured word art that depicted all that DOE and its contractors do within the community. Following, he reviewed a graph representing DOE's engagement arena, which he noted was a simplified view. It was intended to demonstrate the work DOE did daily to build awareness for Hanford Site activities and, ultimately, support. He reflected on the "virtuous circle" concept where relationships were built on trust, resulting in gaining support for the site, which contributed to funding for the site.

Brian discussed cleanup progress, stating that there were three main “product lines” from the cleanup perspective. First was the tank waste mission, where the team was working towards getting back to Direct-Feed Low-Activity Waste (DFLAW) facility melter heatup. That melter was initially started the prior October, but the heatup was halted due to abnormal power delivery conditions. He stated that the team had done a phenomenal job in working with DOE and the vendors to troubleshoot and ensure the issues would be resolved for the next heatup. The Tank-Side Cesium Removal (TSCR) system had completed two campaigns resulting in 250,000 gallons of waste staged and ready for DFLAW. The next TSCR campaign was scheduled for February. Upgrades to the Liquid Effluent Retention Facility (LERF) and the Effluent Treatment Facility (ETF) were underway. The leachate domes were installed at the Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF). Brian noted there was a great collaborative effort between Ecology and DOE in regard to permits, with all relevant permits expected to be in place by the summer.

The second product line was risk reduction. In that space, the K West Basins were undergoing debris disposal activities in preparation for dewatering. The Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility’s (WESF) storage pads were completed. The 324 Building micropiles along the structure were installed, with horizontal and vertical stabilization ongoing. The Hanford Site was on track to treat 2 billion gallons of groundwater through its pump and treat network. Retrieval had begun for tank AX-101, one of the largest tanks in that tank farm.

The third was infrastructure. There were a series of comparatively small projects underway that supported activities and people across the site. The Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) would be starting a replacement of the North Loop electrical distribution system, which was necessary for site reliability. There was a lot of information technology work ongoing, particularly in regard to cyber security. The Hanford Fire Department, Volpentest HAMMER Federal Training Center, and others were continuing to support the mission. There were plans for an upcoming refurbishment effort to maintain the B Reactor as a national monument.

In conclusion, Brian stated that it continued to be a transformational time for the Hanford Site as it transitioned to operations. The focus on safety culture would continue as the pace increased. Work would continue in a fiscally constrained environment, with demonstrating taxpayer value remaining the best approach to ensure continued funding. Efforts to build pride in the workforce would continue. DOE would continue to engage in discussion with the HAB and the broader community to communicate, inform of successes, and build support among the community. He thanked the HAB for its continued support and engagement in the mission,

US Environmental Protection Agency

Dave Einan, EPA, thanked the Board for taking the time to meet with Casey Sixkiller earlier that day, as meeting the communities with which EPA worked was important to Mr. Sixkiller. He also thanked Brian for the Hanford Site tour provided that morning, stating that it was well done and provided Mr. Sixkiller with a perspective on the scale of the mission. Dave reiterated Mr. Sixkiller’s and his own thanks for what the Board contributed and the time the members volunteered, stating that the Board made a difference in cleanup.

Dave reviewed some of the risk reduction efforts discussed during the DOE update. He explained that risk reduction efforts were often the projects performed under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). A project he noted that was not covered in DOE’s update was the K East Safe Storage Enclosure. Brian contributed, stating that it was completed under budget. Dave also noted that the relevant short-term milestones were signed off by all three parties.

Dave recognized that there were questions directed to Mr. Sixkiller related to environmental justice opportunities. He stated that the Board could watch for additional details by email from Roberto Armijo, EPA.

Washington State Department of Ecology

David Bowen, Ecology, started his update by providing Ecology's perspective related to the use of grout as a method of tank waste encapsulation and disposal. He stated that Ecology was not opposed to exploring additional technologies aside from vitrification, including grout, but noted that Hanford's waste was chemically diverse and not easily characterized. He did not expect that a narrow grout formula would likely meet the needs to handle all individual chemical constituents. Given the present knowledge of grout formulas, their durability, and the specific constituents that needed to be addressed in Hanford Site waste, along with the geology of Washington State, disposal of grout would need to be outside the state.

He explained that a large part of the mission was protection of the groundwater and the Columbia River, evidenced by the investment in the extensive pump and treat system on the Hanford Site. Protecting the water in turn protected the region and its economy and impacts to the water could have impacts as far as Oregon and Idaho.

He stated mixed into the conversations around grout were potential cost savings, and there was an impression that Ecology was being overbearing as a regulator. He clarified that Ecology's goal as a regulator was to protect the safety of the people, environment, and the water. When looking at the reports that suggest such cost savings, there's always contingency: words like "potential" or "additional study necessary." That indicated to him that it should be looked at, but things should not be kept on hold for additional decades to reach that certainty. Further, none of the studies factor in the cost of transportation or final disposal. Without those items defined, that either meant that there was an assumption that the waste would be stored on site or that the disposal aspect had not been fully considered, neither of which were acceptable options, given the Hanford Site geology.

He stated that, regardless of how treatment was done, there were processes to get there. A high-level waste (HLW) treatment solution would still be needed. Low-activity waste (LAW) treatment would be needed and potentially alternative treatments. He expected that a diverse solution using a variety of technologies would result.

Ecology was having ongoing discussions with DOE and EPA on vitrification, grout, and alternative treatments. As a couple of examples about how Ecology was engaged, he noted that an Analysis of Alternatives (AOA) report was recently published, and the permitting process for the TBI was underway. He clarified that, in response to a previous statement that TBI was not funded for the year, TBI was funded under a prior year authorization and presently had approximately \$16 million available, which was anticipated to be sufficient for completion of the pilot program.

Moving to his update presentation, David discussed Ecology's recruitment efforts. He stated that the recruitment was back on track, and the agency was filling more vacancies that it was losing to retirement. Knowledge transfer efforts continued as Ecology felt that was critical to its success in the future.

Regarding outreach and education, Ginger Wireman, Ecology, had achieved a lot and made a lot of contacts over 2022. She provided presentations at five elementary schools and three middle and high school events, in addition to supporting events at service organizations, community colleges, and others. The agency was hosting "Let's Talk About Hanford" webinars in February and March and was

supporting a TPA public involvement survey that was presently open. Eight additional presentations were booked for 2023 at that point.

David explained that he was in Washington DC when the President's budget came out. There were several voices that were advocating for Hanford's FY23 budget, with influences that included a letter to President Biden sent by 12 signees and a separate letter sent by the Yakama Nation, a letter to the Washington Congressional Delegation, an Energy Communities Alliance letter, and an Environmental Council of the States letter. Advocacy for the Hanford Site's FY24 was ongoing.

He stated that holistic negotiations continued. The parties achieved conceptual agreement on the matters under negotiation, but details were still being discussed. Upcoming public meetings were planned regarding the Central Plateau milestone changes.

Ecology's compliance activities continue, including conducting inspections and issuing compliance reports. He listed off each of the activities that had occurred since the previous HAB meeting.

Though there were no public comment periods presently open, a comment period for agency-initiated permit modification was planned for March. The modification represented the agreements on seven Solid Waste Operations Complex (SWOC) closure plans being worked on with DOE.

Ecology was actively engaged with an "all hands on deck" approach for the development of the Hanford Site Wide Permit renewal (Rev. 9). As issues came up, they were being elevated and resolved quickly. The permit renewal was tentatively planned for January 2024.

In conclusion, David stated that Ecology hoped to better fill "vacuums in narrative" around Hanford Site issues and concerns. He appreciated the Board's efforts.

Board Questions

Tom Galioto asked for clarification on the work being done in relation to the DFLAW melters. He asked if the work being done was just procedural or if there were still questions to be resolved. Brian stated that the team had resolved some issues, while others were still being corrected and investigated. As an example, there was indication of water on the jewel heater power supply panel that the team still needed to understand the source of. All questions and aspects would be "run to ground" before going back to testing. He reminded the Board that everything being done on DFLAW was a first, and the department was doing everything possible to minimize risk. Other things would likely be discovered as the team worked through the process, which was the intention of such a process. The team needed to ensure that once those melters were full of glass, they could run through their design lifespan, which was why the team was being so thorough and ensuring all lessons learned were incorporated.

Tom Galioto followed up with a different question, asking how budgets would be requested in relation to the adaptive milestones approach: would they be based on milestones in the TPA or regional objectives? For context, Bill Hamel provided an explanation of what the adaptive milestone approach was and how it was established. For the budget requests, he stated, the TPA agencies would collectively determine the budget to be requested based on the data available three years out.

Tom Galioto noted that in the AOA report, there appeared to be an expectation that the DFLAW facility would not achieve the scheduled 2023 start date. Brian stated that the agency was working to deliver capabilities as quickly as it could. He stated that the schedule may be adjusted based on when the melter heatup was achieved. It was too soon to confirm either way.

Jeff Wyatt stated that he appreciated David Bowen's perspective on grout. He noted that he heard concerns about grout stability 50 to 100 years into the future. He asked for clarification on which components presented problems for grout formulation. David prefaced his statement by clarifying that his understanding was at a high level, and as he understood it, there was no formulation for grout that was as protective as glass. The available formulations would result in leaching eventually, creating a need for additional cleanup in the future.

Miya Burke asked Brian for details on a TSCR leak reported on in September by the *Exchange Monitor*. Brian explained that, as part of an inspection and survey process, some minor leak areas were discovered around the fittings, which was not surprising given the nature of the system. Those were within the capacity of the team to decontaminate and continue running the system. Delmar provided additional detail on the nature of the leak and the components involved. At that point, decontamination was complete, and the ion exchange process was continuing. Miya followed up asking for details of cross-site testing. Delmar described the process in which lines that were TSCR lines were disconnected from WTP in order to perform testing. Those would be reconnected when the treatment mission was resumed.

Susan Coleman asked if details of the new tank waste management contract could be shared. Brian stated that they could not be shared due to procurement sensitivity. He stated that he looked forward to seeing it awarded.

Max Woods noted that, the following week, the National Academies of Sciences would be presenting on their review of a the Federally Funded Research and Development Center's (FFRDC) report on grout . Oregon and Washington State representatives would be presenting as well. Max encouraged the Board members to join that meeting. He asked if there were discussions underway with other states or potential commercial disposal facilities. David explained that, when hazardous waste started crossing state lines, the federal agencies became more involved. He stated that Ecology was following what was going on in those states and the private industry but was not directly engaged in those activities. Brian stated that DOE remained connected with each potential waste site, whether commercial or government-controlled, and maintained a continuing dialogue.

Dan Strom noted that, though there were year-over-year budget increases for the Hanford Site shown in DOE's presentation, they did not match the rate of inflation and stated that was effectively a budget cut. He asked how that impacted Hanford Site cleanup. Brian confirmed that it did restrict DOE's buying power, but as always, it continued to optimize the funding received to the maximum extent possible.

Rob Davis noted that the governor of New Mexico made statements that suggested it would no longer allow transuranic (TRU) waste to be disposed of in that state. Rob did not expect that Hanford would be ready to ship its TRU waste in the next ten years and expected DOE would need to look for alternate solutions, were New Mexico to no longer accept TRU waste after that point. He asked if the Board should be concerned about that. Brian stated that, were a citizen concerned about that, it would be appropriate to voice those concerns. He stated that there was always a need to look at the downstream effects as the cleanup missions was a long-term effort. He stated that the HAB was a great place to share such concerns.

Miya asked for an update on the status of the pretreatment facility. Brian stated that it was effectively in the same state that it was in during 2012. The technical issues previously identified with the facility had since been resolved, and the structure and equipment were being preserved as assets. There were designs in place to continue work on the facility, but it was not funded. Miya noted an earlier discussion of jewel heaters and a discovery of water in the panel. She stated that a recent Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) report suggested that it was a significant amount of water. Brian clarified that was a different issue being reported on that was related to the offgas system. It was explained that through

testing, it was discovered that the associated automatic drain was not functioning as intended. Such challenges were expected to be discovered as the facility moved through the startup process.

Jeff relayed a question from another member of the OHCB that asked for an update on the 200 Area burial grounds, such as an update on characterization efforts or remedial actions planned. Bill stated that there were no actions planned in that area based on the most recent groundwater monitoring results.

Draft Advice on Fiscal Year 2025 Cleanup Priorities

Chris Sutton provided an overview of the development process for the proposed Board advice on FY25 Hanford Site cleanup priorities. He explained that would be his third year of involvement in development of such advice, and many members had already provided input and support to its development. He clarified that the draft was still being considered within the IM team.

He provided an overview of the high-level categories of priorities that the previous year's advice was structured around. Those included:

- Tank Waste Cleanup
- Central Plateau Cleanup
- River Corridor Cleanup
- Indirect/Supporting Activities

Chris explained that within those categories, priority levels of “critical” and “important” were applied to specific activated. Critical were those the Board believed to be essential, while important was applied to priorities that would ideally occur after critical items were covered. The items were not listed in any priority outside of those two designations. He noted that the advice would not cover “min-safe,” maintenance, or infrastructure support activities as these were necessary to be funded regardless of cleanup priorities. The advice as developed under the assumption that the FY24 priorities listed in the Hanford 5-Year Plan would be completed.

At that time, the nine members of the IM team had held a round robin to gather initial input from the team on priorities and advice structure. The first draft was developed and distributed to the team for review, which had since resulted in a second draft. He noted that what was heard in that meeting could be incorporated into the next draft.

He explained that in the FY25 cleanup priorities draft, only critical items were listed. The IM team was considering how to best indicate what was recommended for acceleration or where the project was felt to be beneficial to pursue where additional funding was available. The IM team was considering development of a shorter, more easily read advice letter that included more detailed backup information as an appendix. The team felt that would be beneficial for some of the individuals on the HAB's advice distribution list, such as congressional delegation members for Washington and Oregon.

Chris or other IM team representative planned to visit each of the HAB's committees to gather their input on priorities. The BCC planned to meet in late March for committee approval of the draft in preparation for consensus approval by the Board in April. It was necessary for the advice to be submitted in that time frame for it to be considered by DOE in time for the budget approval cycle.

Board Questions

Dan Solitz considered the option of the Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) establishing an IM team to explore options for a HAB- or PIC-specific outreach budget. He invited HAB members to attend the upcoming PIC meeting to discuss the matter.

Rose Ferri asked about the target date for completion of the advice letter. Chris explained that the final letter would be finalized by the Board and potentially approved consensus during April 19 and 20 meeting. It would be signed and submitted to DOE within the days following that meeting. The draft would need to be ready for distribution as part of the meeting packet by April 3.

Dave Einan noted that there was not a one-to-one relationship between cleanup projects and the risk reduction business line. He asked that the Board keep that in mind as it developed its advice. He stated that cleanup needed to occur as a whole and that the total cleanup should not be deprioritized in favor of specific projects.

Tom Sicilia clarified that, as the committee meetings approached, the draft and its format would likely have advanced. He noted that each committee and member had the opportunity to contribute, and the draft served as a framework for the committee to discuss.

Tom Galioto noted that the intention of evening Board meetings was to draw public attention and attendance. He asked if that participation had been quantified. Ruth explained that the day's meeting attendance had not been tallied yet, but the public in attendance would be listed in its own category within the meeting minutes.

Connecting with Constituencies

Mike Berkenbile provided background for the subject of discussion. The intent was to set the group up for success in subsequent discussions on how the Board members were carrying the information back to their constituencies and how they bring the concerns of their constituencies back to the TPA agencies. He understood that the two-way communication was occurring, but in his time with the Board, the members had not come together to discuss how that was occurring. He hoped that such discussions could become a regular agenda item, serving as an opportunity for members to benchmark one another and apply lessons learned.

Ruth Nicholson explained that the PIC had similar, recurring agenda item that it called "HAB Self-Assessments." Dan Solitz, the PIC chair, explained that the PIC members' self-assessments were intended to be more than just how they informed their constituencies, but also how they communicated Hanford-related information to the general public. He acknowledged that they were difficult discussions to have with the public, as it was not a popular subject, but the PIC's agenda item served as a means to get ideas about how to create those successes.

Jeff Wyatt explained that the OHCB, the organization he represented on the HAB, met three times a year to get updates from the TPA agencies. One of the OHCB's goals for that year was to do more in the area of public outreach. He noted that Max Woods was drafting a letter on that matter. The OHCB members were investigating environmental justice and other public involvement grants, holding conference calls with several environmental organizations in Oregon, and looking for opportunities to provide speakers and informational materials on Hanford to educational institutions.

Max explained that the letter being considered would be styled similarly to the governor's letter around Hanford Site funding and would be targeted to the Oregon legislature, which had several new members. Max explained that in his own role with the Oregon Department of Energy, he briefed up and down his management chain on Hanford matters, up to and including the Oregon governor's office. As an example, he had an upcoming meeting planned with the governor's policy directors. He also discussed Hanford matters at the county level. The discussions at level were more often sharing information and what was happening, rather than policy issues.

Pam Larsen discussed her previous job as director of Hanford Communities. Each of the four cities and two counties that comprise the Tri-Cities would appoint an elected official to be on the Board of Hanford Communities. As a member of the HAB, she would identify topics of interest to elected officials and arrange for speakers on those subjects. As an example, she arranged a panel of individuals to discuss the WTP, which included the president of Bechtel alongside representatives for DOE and Ecology. Such discussions were often filmed and broadcast on local access television. Additionally, she would provide a yearly presentation to elected officials of each jurisdiction to summarize that year at Hanford. That position was similar to what she presently did as a representative of Benton County. She anticipated that she would be presenting to the Benton County elected officials that February and provide those individuals an opportunity to ask questions. Such presentations served as a means of dialogue and information sharing.

Pam noted that another topic she was involved in with Hanford Communities was emergency management, serving as liaison between the Benton County emergency operations center, the federal emergency operations center, and Energy Northwest. As cleanup progressed, however, it became more difficult to come up with scenarios that would require that level of emergency response.

Chris Sutton noted that Pam's explanation answered some of his questions. He was interested about who members of the Board that represented government reported to, what kind of feedback was received, and how that feedback was represented on the HAB.

Rob Parmelee explained that he was not clear how Hanford Site workforce representatives or Public at Large members were intended to gather feedback to represent their constituencies. Ruth noted that the HAB was created as a board of interests but there were some exceptions, such as Public at Large seats and employees. Employees were selected to serve on the Board so that perspective would be part of Board discussions.

Ginger Wireman explained that she worked with Ryan Miller in outreach. She suggested that something that each HAB member could do was fill out the TPA public involvement survey and push that information out to people. The survey was framed to hear from individuals that were not presently involved in public outreach activities. She explained that, should any HAB members—or their friends and family—be a part of club or organizations such as the Rotary Club, Kiwanis, or the Tri-Cities Regional Chamber of Commerce, that she or DOE representatives could go to those groups to discuss Hanford matters. Ruth read off a comment in the Microsoft Teams chat that confirming that DOE speakers could be arranged through the Hanford Speakers Bureau.

Jan Catrell explained that, as a representative of the Washington League of Women Voters, she had the opportunity from time to time to speak to the organization's president about Hanford matters and distribute information to the organization that helped its members better understand and evaluate news on Hanford. As an example, she wrote an article for the organization's newsletter in response to television reports on leaking tanks that discussed the history of the tanks, mitigation measures in place, and work underway to remove contaminant from the earth and groundwater, such as the pump and treat system.

Michelle Holt noted that she was also interested to learn how the local government representatives communicated Hanford issues. She explained that the Benton-Franklin Council of Governments was made up of representatives of all the other local governments and, because each of the local governments were represented on the Board, she was not clear who she was expected to report back to. She explained that what the Council of Government did was administer programs that dovetailed with federal partners or activities in the region. As an example, they served as the metropolitan planning organization for Benton

and Franklin Counties under the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Authority, and the Washington Department of Transportation.

When the HAB discussed employee issues or concerns around transportation related to Hanford, she expected that she could serve as a conduit for those concerns, bringing those back to planning or proposing possible advice in that those areas. As another example, she explained that the Council of Governments maintained the comprehensive economic development strategy, which Hanford played a large role in. She hoped that her participation with the Board would allow her to implement the feedback received in such planning and studies.

Steve Anderson explained that he was on the Board at the request of the Franklin County commissioner to have a representative for Franklin Counties. When he accepted, he did not realize that he would be representing Grant County as well. He noted he was glad to learn that member recruitment efforts were expanding in that region. He stated that he was the president of the Energy Supplier Alliance, a group of small local business, with which he discussed Hanford activities. He explained that part of the reason he joined the HAB was a general perspective of negativity among people he had talked to about the HAB. He did not feel that was fair and joined because he firmly believed that there needed to be public involvement in cleanup.

Rob Davis noted that it was previously discussed how he reported back the Pasco City Council. He noted that, in the history of the Board, there were several instances where situations on the Hanford Site were learned about as a result of workforce seats. He stated that the establishment of the Hanford Site's beryllium program was influenced by HAB advice, which originated from such concerns being voiced on the Board by a workforce representative. He stated that the Board was about more than hearing what the people the seats represented wanted, as it was also about learning about what was done on the Hanford Site. He felt that two-way communication was important.

Miya having discussed her role previously, provided additional examples. She attended a Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection Committee (HSEP) tour of the 324 Building mockup facility and shared photos of the tour through Hanford Challenge's social media, which resulted in positive reactions. She also often shared DOE media such as videos that were initially shared with the HAB. A former Board member, Vince Panesko, was invited to speak as part of the Hanford Challenge nuclear waste scholar series of videos. She explained that she often learned about new subjects through the Board and took that information back to make it more accessible to a wider audience.

John Smart stated that he took the information learned back to the West Richland City Council and citizens, noting that Michelle hit on many of the points of interest already. He felt that the Board functioned well in helping his understanding of Hanford activities and his ability to get that information back to constituents. He noted that heard comments from citizens over the years about access to Hanford lands, often not wondering why they could not go there. He believed progress could be made in that realm. He was also interested in many of the same aspects Michelle discussed, such as planning and the outlook for the city. River health was a concern for the city, as it got some of its potable water from the Columbia River, and citizens were often concerned in relation to fishing and swimming. He clarified that he was appointed to the Board to serve the citizens of West Richland and communicate their concerns.

It was noted that the Board chair would likely be requested to support development of an article about the HAB for the *Tri-Cities Area Journal of Business*.

Dan Solitz noted that intergenerational equity was an important idea to consider and that Hanford matters should be communicated in a way that it would be clear what happened 100 or more years from that point.

Public Comment

On the first day of the meeting, Antone (Tony) Brooks, provided a comment. He explained that he served on the HAB for several years, but his term ran out. He stated that, after leaving, he had a thought: there were many good engineers and regulators supporting the Hanford Site, but no little biology support. He stated that he, along with David Howl and Wayne Glines, wrote a recent paper on the radiobiology and Hanford's tank waste that was published in the *Health Physics Journal*. He stated that the biology was important in terms of risk. As an example, he stated iodine-129 had a very long half-life; so long that one could not get enough of it in their body to have an effect. He stated that was supported through testing. As another example, he stated that technetium-99 had no biological function as it cleared the body very rapidly. He stated that the paper went over the biological aspects of many of the constituents of concern on site and recommended that the Board members, particularly those that participated in the TWC, to read it.

On the second day, additional public comment was offered.

Tom Galioto explained that he was offering comment on the operations workgroup discussion as an individual because his organization had not yet determined its stance on the matter. He felt that the matters being discussed by the workgroup were important to the HAB and that the workgroup had done a great job. He felt that there were many details that still needed to be defined.

In Tom's opinion, the Board needed to overcome several years of difficulty between DOE and the HAB, and trust needed to be rebuilt. He stated that he had seen things like a lack of follow up to requests, an inability to discuss issues, and a tremendous amount of intellectual and institutional knowledge lost over the preceding year. He expected more would be lost that year. He felt that there was a need for the groups to come together as a team and they were not quite there yet but expected the effort would be worthwhile. He commented that the presentations that DOE provided the previous day were exceptional, with a lot of accomplishments to report in regard to cleanup.

Tom hoped to focus attention on how to proceed from that point and how to rebuild trust. He asked that the workgroup be open and transparent in its work to gain acceptance through the HAB. He felt that it was critical for the HAB to understand what was being done and the direction it would be taking. He wanted the HAB to have a full understanding of what it was agreeing to and be comfortable with the decisions being by the time it discussed the matter at its April meeting.

Shelley Cimon introduced herself, explaining that she served in leadership on the HAB for many years. She agreed with Tom, stating that the prior few years were difficult for the Board, being unable to discuss many of the topics that were important to the Board. She felt that it would be to the Board's benefit to have a process that was streamlined and well-understood by all involved, allowing for the most participation. She agreed with Pam Larsen's comments on the operations workgroup matters, worrying that the resource team concept would add an unnecessary step in development of topics for the Board. She did not feel that it would be advantageous for the Board or its committees.

She stated that, when the committees met in the past, they were the hub for advice. The TPA agencies came to the committees to discuss their ideas and ask for opinions. All parties talked collaboratively. Shelley stated that the Board members were all volunteers and that adding the additional layer did not sound valuable. She felt that the advice process that the Board utilized, as it went from committees to the Board, was clear, succinct, and proven.

Shelley noted that, as other sites in the DOE Complex completed their cleanup efforts and other sites closed, the Hanford Site cleanup would become a regional issue rather than a national one. She stated that there would come a time when the Hanford Site was the only one lobbying for funding. At that time, she stated, the HAB would be even more important, as everyone in the northwest would need to work together towards getting waste vitrified.

Tri-Party Agreement Agency Update on 2023 HAB Membership Package

Mike Berkenbile explained that the period of recruitment being discussed was the span from September 1, 2022 to December 31, 2022. The approach to recruitment was a collaborative effort among the TPA agencies, the Washington Governor's office, and HAB members. Recruitment was done through a variety of means, from social media to personal outreach.

Two new organizations had been proposed for the Board, which included Columbia Basin College (CBC) and the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce. Departing organizations included Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington and the University of Washington. There were three primary membership seats unfilled, which included the Washington Building Trades Council, the regional public health seat, and Washington State University (WSU). Mike noted that WSU has an alternate member appointed.

He listed the five primary membership renewals and 14 continuing primary membership seats, noting that three of those would require membership extensions, and listed existing seats that would appoint new primary members. Following, he listed the new memberships, renewals, and departures of alternate members.

Ryan Miller shared the names of the six new Public at Large seats in the membership package.

Roberto Armijo discussed the focuses in membership recruitment. He explained that, working collaboratively, the agencies sought new organizations to fill the vacancies on the Board while working to assure active participation on the Board. He felt that the efforts were off to a good start.

Gary Younger agreed, stating that it was a collaborative and transparent process on a "new level" compared to what was done in the past. He was proud of the work that was done and felt that it represented a level of effort that would not have been possible with one agency alone. He noted that stakeholders also contributed. He appreciated the efforts by the HAB membership.

Gary explained that the recruitment period was longer than previous efforts and started earlier, representing application of lessons learned from previous recruitment efforts. He noted, however, that that recruitment was a year-round process. He invited nominations at any time, noting that when applications could be formally submitted, they could be ready with advanced notice.

He explained that, in order to assure an October 1 appointment date for members, typically all items would need to be submitted by April. Labor Day was identified as a goal for submission, potentially allowing membership confirmation before the target date. He stated that, once the membership package was submitted, it would become a DOE function exclusively. He intended to follow the status of the package closely once submitted.

Ryan stated that one of his goals at Ecology was getting the recruitment efforts back to being a collaborative process. He hoped that, in the next recruitment cycle, the agencies could seek more engagement from the HAB and get input and help in filling membership vacancies. He recognized the difficulties that the long approval cycle posed, stating that an individual's life circumstances could change in the six or more months the process took. He and David Bowen were looking for ways to potentially shorten that approval process. He thanked the others for the collaborative effort.

Ruth Nicholson provided clarification on nominating authorities for various seats, noting that some organizations nominate their own members to represent them, while others like Non-Union, Non-Management Employee representatives were nominated by the TPA agencies.

Board Questions

Rose Ferri asked who to contact with potential nominations and asked if individuals from outside of the immediate region could be nominated. Gary asked that individuals apply for membership, and the three agencies would collectively accept the nomination or determine additional questions to ask. He stated that though recruitment was focused closer to the Hanford Site, applications were accepted from areas outside of the immediate region as there were individuals were interest and knowledge that could be valuable for the Board.

Tom Sicilia noted that, when he joined the Board before the present approval process was in place, he applied in July and was on the Board before the end of the year.

Chris Sutton asked for clarification on how many new members would be joining the Board the following year. Mike stated that there were six new Public at Large members, six new primary members, and five new alternate members. Gary contributed, noting that there were two new organizations joining the Board. He stated that was important as the agencies were trying to reach out to more groups.

Jeff Wyatt was interested in the TPA agencies' thoughts on membership retention. Mike felt that retention would be proportional to the members' experience with the HAB. He felt that continued orientation was important. He felt that year's orientation went well as a result of extensive planning and preparation. He stated that those that assisted in planning had an understanding that orientation was not a one-time effort, but an ongoing one. He understood the value of volunteer time and expected recruitment would be dependent on both the individuals' experience and sense of contribution in relation to the time spent. He stated that, in his own experience, he did not like to spend his time where he did not feel he could make a positive contribution and expected that many others would feel the same way. He noted that all HAB members had the opportunity to shape that experience as well.

Ryan contributed, stating that the agencies were working to seek members that they believed would actively engage with the Board, understanding that no one would reasonably be expected to attend every meeting. They hoped to find members that were interested and willing to serve.

Roberto added that there were some individuals that might only be able to serve part of their membership term but hoped that they could have a positive experience with the Board in the time served. Mike noted that there was language within its present guidance documents that provided the Board options to replace members that are no longer able to participate.

Rose suggested that, for a new member, one of the most difficult and discouraging aspects was the heavy use of acronyms in Hanford discussions.

Michelle Holt suggested frequent communications and information might not be the best way for members to get informed and engaged. She felt overwhelmed by the number of HAB related emails received, recognizing that many of those consisted of forwarding of press releases and newsletters. She hoped those could be consolidated, particularly when the information consisted of "nice to know" items, such as news from facilities other than Hanford. Ruth stated that she would explore options for consolidating more items into the weekly updates.

Rob Davis stated that meetings served as a means of education and encouraged individuals to ask questions. He suggested that the TPA agencies could provide more educational types of presentations to assist new members.

Chris noted that an aspect to the operations workgroup's resource team concept was mentoring for new members on a smaller scale, which was not previously discussed.

Steve Anderson wondered if applicants for Board membership could be put on email distribution early so they could begin learning before being expected to participate. Mike stated that was something that was done that year, with members being invited to orientation and meetings prior to official membership approval, but encountered some challenges related to Board actions. He expected that there was an appropriate means and timeframe for early engagement of new members that could be refined going forward.

In closing, Ryan shared that there was work ongoing to update a 2012 HAB nomination and application process document that the agencies hoped to have implemented by the next recruitment cycle. He expected that a draft would be ready to share with the HAB in the near future.

Board Business

Ruth Nicholson stated that the next meeting was the COTW to further refine the operations workgroup committee proposal. She invited members to come with their ideas, questions, and concerns.

Rob Davis invited members to attend the upcoming TWC meeting. He noted that a presentation on the WTP progress was planned. He wondered if a tour of DFLAW facility was possible before the facility started up. Gary stated that the HAB was a priority group for tours, but logistics and timing would need to be determined. He noted that the Hanford virtual tours were available online and allowed visitors to view facilities and areas that were closed off to the public.

Dan Solitz and Tom Sicilia invited members to attend the upcoming PIC and RAP meetings, respectively. It was noted that committee leadership elections would occur in the upcoming committee meetings.

It was clarified that the most recent HAB work plan and calendar were available online.

Richard Bloom hoped to schedule a call to plan an upcoming HSEP meeting.

Meeting Feedback

Ruth invited feedback on what went well in the Board meeting. 4

Jeff Wyatt felt that Casey Sixkiller's presentation was great and felt that the dialogue and member Board introductions were valuable.

Susan Coleman was glad to see Board leadership elections completed.

Rose also found Board member introductions to be valuable. She felt it was important to understand who was participating and what organizations or interests those members represented.

Tom Galioto commended Tom Sicilia and Chris Sutton for their presentation on the Operations Workgroup.

Ruth invited feedback on what members wished had gone differently.

Michelle Holt felt a laminated card with common acronyms would be valuable.

Jeff felt that DOE did a good job of representing the challenges it faced, but he did not get a sense of that from Ecology or EPA.

Tom Galioto felt that the evening meeting format should be evaluated in regard to how many members of the public were in attendance.

Chris found that placement of the projector and screens in the room awkward. Mike agreed but noted that was a challenge to keep those consistent with varied venues in which meetings were held. He suggested that members bring a device to see those presentations on Microsoft Teams as well.

Richard Bloom suggested that the PIC could look into how Board meetings were advertised in relation to attendance by the public.

Jeff felt that the evening sessions detracted from members' ability to informally get together afterwards for dinner or drinks.

Ruth invited final thoughts.

Rob suggested that name tent content could be printed larger.

Laurene Contreras wondered if there was a historical account, memorial, or recognition of individuals that had an impact at Hanford, particularly those that had passed. Jan Catrell recalled a previous exhibit at the Reach Museum and an installation at the Richland Library. Ryan Miller suggested that the [Hanford Oral Histories](#) was a good resource, as well as the [Voices of the Manhattan Project](#). Ginger Wireman suggested working with the National Parks Service to find a way to recognize such individuals. She felt that physical memorials would be valuable.

Closing

Mike Berkenbile thanked Jan Catrell for her service as interim Board chair, Susan Coleman for her service as interim HAB vice chair, and Pam Larsen for her service as National Liaison.

Meeting Recording

Day 1: <https://youtu.be/mqLipGDafXc>

Day 2: <https://youtu.be/4H2bxMDPNMI>

Attachments

[Attachment 1: Meeting Agenda](#)

[Attachment 2: Deputy Designated Federal Officer Slide](#)

[Attachment 3: Draft Meeting Minutes for June 2022 Board Meeting](#)

[Attachment 4: Draft Meeting Minutes for October 2022 Board Meeting](#)

[Attachment 5: Draft Meeting Minutes for May 2022 Committee of the Whole](#)

[Attachment 6: Draft Meeting Minutes for September 2022 Committee of the Whole](#)

[Attachment 7: Draft Meeting Minutes for November 2022 Committee of the Whole](#)

[Attachment 8: Board Leadership Candidate Statements](#)

[Attachment 9: HAB Operations Improvement Workgroup Presentation](#)

[Attachment 10: DOE Update Presentation](#)

[Attachment 11: Ecology Update Presentation](#)

[Attachment 12: 2025 Cleanup Priorities Issue Manager Team Briefing](#)

Meeting Attendees

Day 1

Board Members and Alternates:

Bob Thompson, Primary	Chris Sutton, Primary*	Dan Strom, Primary*
Esteban Ortiz, Primary	Jan Catrell, Primary*	Jeff Wyatt, Primary*
Jessica Black, Primary	John Smart, Primary*	Kristie Baptiste-Eke, Primary
Laurene Contreras, Primary*	Maxwell Woods, Primary*	Michelle Holt, Primary*
Miya Burke, Primary*	Rob Davis, Primary*	Rob Parmalee, Primary
Steve Anderson, Primary*	Susan Coleman, Primary*	Tim Kavis, Primary*
Todd Myers, Primary	Tom Galioto, Primary*	Alfonso Contreras, Alternate*
Dan Solitz, Alternate	Mason Murphy, Alternate	Pam Larsen, Alternate*
Richard Bloom, Alternate*	Rose Ferri, Alternate*	Simone Anter, Alternate
Tom Sicilia, Alternate		

Others:

Bill Hamel, DOE*	Alicia Boyd, ECY	Tyler Oates, Bechtel
Brian Harkins, DOE*	David Bowen, ECY*	Dieter Bohrmann, CPCCo
Brian Stickney, DOE	Ed Holbrook, ECY	Coleen Drinkard, HMIS
Brian Vance, DOE*	Ginger Wireman, ECY*	Dana Cowley, HMIS*
Carrie Meyer, DOE*	Jeffrey Lyon, ECY	Debbie Kelley, HMIS
Delmar Noyes, DOE*	Neil Caudill, ECY	Debra Yergen, HMIS*
Gary Younger, DOE*	Ryan Miller, ECY*	Patrick Conrad, HMIS*
Glyn Trenchard, DOE*	Abby Hook, EPA	Gerry Pollet, HOANW
Greg Jones, DOE*	Anne McCartney, EPA*	Jim Doherty, OHCUB*
Mike Berkenbile, DOE*	Calvin Terara, EPA*	Li Wang, YN ERNW
Pam Zimmerman, DOE*	Casey Sixkiller, EPA*	Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge
Tom Fletcher, DOE*	Craig Cameron, EPA*	Matt Hendrickson, ODOE

	Dave Einan, EPA*	Tracy Barker, AVANTech
	Geoff Schramm, EPA*	Anna Lin King, NWPB
	Laura Buelow, EPA*	Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald
	Michelle Mullin, EPA*	Kelsey Shank, TheEDGE
	Roberto Armijo, EPA*	Antone Brooks*
	Earl Fordham, WA DOH*	KB
	Tom Rogers, WADOH*	Laura Feldman
		Susan Leckband*
		Jodi Christiansen, Facilitation*
		Josh Patnaude, Facilitation*
		Lacey Mansius, Facilitation*
		Olivia Wilcox, Facilitation*
		Ruth Nicholson, Facilitation*

Day 2

Board Members and Alternates:

Bob Thompson, Primary	Chris Sutton, Primary*	Esteban Ortiz, Primary
Jacob Reynolds, Primary	Jan Catrell, Primary*	Jeff Wyatt, Primary*
Jessica Black, Primary	John Smart, Primary*	Kristie Baptiste-Eke, Primary
Laurene Contreras, Primary*	Maxwell Woods, Primary*	Michelle Holt, Primary*
Miya Burke, Primary*	Rob Davis, Primary*	Rob Parmalee, Primary
Steve Anderson, Primary	Susan Coleman, Primary	Tim Kavis, Primary*
Todd Myers, Primary	Tom Galioto, Primary*	Alfonso Contreras, Alternate*
Dan Solitz, Alternate	Pam Larsen, Alternate	Rose Ferri, Alternate
Richard Bloom, Alternate*	Simone Anter, Alternate	Tom Sicilia, Alternate

Others:

Gary Younger, DOE*	Edward Holbrook, ECY	Dieter Bohrmann, CPCCo
Mike Berkenbile, DOE*	Ginger Wireman, ECY*	Coleen Drinkard, HMIS
	Ryan Miller, ECY	Dana Cowley, HMIS

	Roberto Armijo, EPA*	Debbie Kelley, HMIS
	Earl Fordham, WADOH*	Debra Yergen, HMIS*
	Tom Rogers, WADOH*	Patrick Conrad, HMIS
		Kermit Mankiller, NPT
		Matt Hendrickson, ODOE
		Shelley Cimon, Columbia Riverkeeper
		Laura Feldman
		Jodi Christiansen, Facilitation*
		Josh Patnaude, Facilitation*
		Lacey Mansius, Facilitation*
		Olivia Wilcox, Facilitation*
		Ruth Nicholson, Facilitation*

** Denotes that the individual signed in or was otherwise noted as attending the meeting in-person.*

Note: Remote participants for this hybrid meeting were asked to sign in with their name and affiliation in the chat box of Microsoft Teams, while in-person participants were asked to sign in on paper. Not all attendees shared this information. The attendance list reflects what information was collected at the meeting.